UNITED STATES PATENT AND TRADEMARK OFFICE

UNITED STATES DEPARTMENT OF COMMERCE
United States Patent and Trademark Office
Address: COMMISSIONER FOR PATENTS
P.O. Box 1450
Alexandria, Virginia 22313-1450
www.uspto.gov

APPLICATION NO.	FILING DATE	FIRST NAMED INVENTOR	ATTORNEY DOCKET NO.	CONFIRMATION NO.
10/791,965	03/03/2004	Gary Kramer	10656-4	5093

7590 01/26/2006

Brown Raysman Millstein Felder & Steiner LLP
Suite 711
1880 Century Park East
Los Angeles, CA 90067

EXAMINER	
CHAKRABORTY, SUPRATIK	
ART UNIT	**PAPER NUMBER**
2672	

DATE MAILED: 01/26/2006

Please find below and/or attached an Office communication concerning this application or proceeding.

Office Action Summary	Application No.	Applicant(s)	
	10/791,965	KRAMER ET AL.	
	Examiner	Art Unit	
	Supratik Chakraborty	2672	

-- The MAILING DATE of this communication appears on the cover sheet with the correspondence address --

Period for Reply

A SHORTENED STATUTORY PERIOD FOR REPLY IS SET TO EXPIRE 3 MONTH(S) FROM THE MAILING DATE OF THIS COMMUNICATION.

- Extensions of time may be available under the provisions of 37 CFR 1.136(a). In no event, however, may a reply be timely filed after SIX (6) MONTHS from the mailing date of this communication.
- If the period for reply specified above is less than thirty (30) days, a reply within the statutory minimum of thirty (30) days will be considered timely.
- If NO period for reply is specified above, the maximum statutory period will apply and will expire SIX (6) MONTHS from the mailing date of this communication.
- Failure to reply within the set or extended period for reply will, by statute, cause the application to become ABANDONED (35 U.S.C. § 133). Any reply received by the Office later than three months after the mailing date of this communication, even if timely filed, may reduce any earned patent term adjustment. See 37 CFR 1.704(b).

Status

1)☒ Responsive to communication(s) filed on *03 March 2004*.

2a)☐ This action is **FINAL**. 2b)☒ This action is non-final.

3)☐ Since this application is in condition for allowance except for formal matters, prosecution as to the merits is closed in accordance with the practice under *Ex parte Quayle*, 1935 C.D. 11, 453 O.G. 213.

Disposition of Claims

4)☒ Claim(s) *1-57* is/are pending in the application.

4a) Of the above claim(s) _____ is/are withdrawn from consideration.

5)☐ Claim(s) _____ is/are allowed.

6)☒ Claim(s) *1-57* is/are rejected.

7)☐ Claim(s) _____ is/are objected to.

8)☐ Claim(s) _____ are subject to restriction and/or election requirement.

Application Papers

9)☐ The specification is objected to by the Examiner.

10)☐ The drawing(s) filed on _____ is/are: a)☐ accepted or b)☐ objected to by the Examiner.

Applicant may not request that any objection to the drawing(s) be held in abeyance. See 37 CFR 1.85(a).

Replacement drawing sheet(s) including the correction is required if the drawing(s) is objected to. See 37 CFR 1.121(d).

11)☐ The oath or declaration is objected to by the Examiner. Note the attached Office Action or form PTO-152.

Priority under 35 U.S.C. § 119

12)☐ Acknowledgment is made of a claim for foreign priority under 35 U.S.C. § 119(a)-(d) or (f).

a)☐ All b)☐ Some * c)☐ None of:

1.☐ Certified copies of the priority documents have been received.

2.☐ Certified copies of the priority documents have been received in Application No. _____.

3.☐ Copies of the certified copies of the priority documents have been received in this National Stage application from the International Bureau (PCT Rule 17.2(a)).

* See the attached detailed Office action for a list of the certified copies not received.

Attachment(s)

1) ☒ Notice of References Cited (PTO-892)
2) ☐ Notice of Draftsperson's Patent Drawing Review (PTO-948)
3) ☒ Information Disclosure Statement(s) (PTO-1449 or PTO/SB/08) Paper No(s)/Mail Date _____
4) ☐ Interview Summary (PTO-413) Paper No(s)/Mail Date. _____ .
5) ☐ Notice of Informal Patent Application (PTO-152)
6) ☐ Other: _____.

DETAILED ACTION

Claim Rejections - 35 USC § 103

1. The following is a quotation of 35 U.S.C. 103(a) which forms the basis for all obviousness rejections set forth in this Office action:

(a) A patent may not be obtained though the invention is not identically disclosed or described as set forth in section 102 of this title, if the differences between the subject matter sought to be patented and the prior art are such that the subject matter as a whole would have been obvious at the time the invention was made to a person having ordinary skill in the art to which said subject matter pertains. Patentability shall not be negatived by the manner in which the invention was made.

The factual inquiries set forth in *Graham* **v.** *John Deere Co.*, 383 U.S. 1, 148 USPQ 459 (1966), that are applied for establishing a background for determining obviousness under 35 U.S.C. 103(a) are summarized as follows:

1. Determining the scope and contents of the prior art.
2. Ascertaining the differences between the prior art and the claims at issue.
3. Resolving the level of ordinary skill in the pertinent art.
4. Considering objective evidence present in the application indicating obviousness or nonobviousness.

2. **Claims 1-6,23,24,27-32,34,41,44,47-53 are rejected under 35 U.S.C. 103(a) as being unpatentable over Maehara et al (Patent#: 6,556,201) and further in view of Hirano (Patent#: 6,885,408).**

3. **Regarding Claim 1**, Maehara et al teach the following limitations of the claim:

A system for rendering at least one image interactive from the point of view of a user (col.2, lines 59-67), the system comprising:

(1) Software for delivering each image layer sequentially to a display device capable of displaying the at least one image layer (col. 3, lines 41-

44). The reference teaches about moving images, which in order to be shown, needs to be displayed sequentially.

(2) Software for displaying each image layer such that only one image layer is the currently viewable image layer from the point of view of the user at any given time (col.4, lines 5-15).

(3) Software for enabling the at least one interactive function with respect to the at least one image, so that the user perceives the illusion of movement in two dimensions or three dimensions (col.2, lines 59-61).

Except,

(4) Software for processing the at least one image so that one image layer is provided for each of the at least one images.

Hirano teaches the above limitation in (col.2, lines 16-22).

Therefore, it would have been obvious to one of ordinary skill in the art to combine the image rendering technique as taught by Maehera et al., the providing of the image layer as taught by Hirano in order to adjust image quality by performing adaptive image processing according to the status of the image layer.

4. **Regarding Claim 2**, Maehara et al. further teach at least one image comprises a plurality of images of at least one object wherein each image represents a view of the at least one object that is captured at a different angle with respect to the at least one object (col.2, lines 5-9).

5. **Regarding Claim 3**, Maehara et al. teach that at least one image comprises a plurality of images of at least one object wherein each image represents a view of the at least one object that was captured at a different angle in a particular plane of the at least one object (col.2, lines 6-9).

6. **Regarding Claim 4**, Maehara et al teach that each image in the plurality of images represents a view of the at least one object that is captured at a different angle in a particular plane of the at least one object through 0 to 360 degrees or some fraction thereof (col.9, lines 46-49).

7. **Regarding Claim 5**, Maehara et al. teach that the software for enabling the at least one interactive function causes the software for displaying each image layer to sequentially display each image layer as the currently viewable image layer to provide the illusion of movement in three dimensions (col.9, lines 23-27).

8. **Regarding Claim 6**, Maehara et al. teach that the software for enabling the at least one interactive function accepts input from the user that controls the degree to which the user perceives the illusion of movement in three dimensions (col.30, lines 15-25).

9. **Regarding Claim 23**, Maehara et al. and teach all the limitations of the claim.

10. **Regarding Claim 24**, Maehara et al teach that plurality of images are digital images (col.4, lines 5-8).

11. **Regarding Claim 27**, Hirano teaches the software for controlling the display provides each image in a separate layer, and only one such image layer is viewable by a user at any given time (col.2, lines 38-45).

12. **Regarding Claim 28**, Maehara et al teach that the plurality of images further comprise different images of the at least one object which are captured in at least one plane of the object through 0 to 360 degrees or some fraction thereof (Fig.11).

13. **Regarding Claim 29**, Maehara et al teach that the software for the interactive function simulates the rotation of the object through three dimensions by sequentially first displaying and then hiding each image layer to the user at discrete increments of time (col.30, lines 14-23). Although the reference doesn't mention the hiding of each image layer, it does teach the changing of the virtual viewpoint that will change the orientation of the object

in question by not revealing all the aspects of the object that is being photographed.

14. **Regarding Claim 30**, Maehara et al teach that the discrete increments of time are capable of being specified by the user (col. 30, lines 24-25).

15. **Regarding Claim 31**, Maehara et al teach that the plurality of images further comprise different images of the at least one object which are captured in a plurality of planes of the object through 0 to 360 degrees or some fraction thereof (Fig. 11).

16. **Regarding Claim 32**, Maehara et al teach that the software for the interactive function simulates the rotation of the object through three dimensions in each of the plurality of planes by sequentially first displaying and then hiding each image layer to the user at discrete increments of time (col. 30, lines 14-23).

17. **Regarding Claim 34**, Maehara et al teach that the software for controlling the display provides each image in a separate layer, each such image layer has approximately the same height and width as ever other image layer, and only one such image layer is viewable by a user at any given time (col.9, lines 23-27). The references teaches about the capture of images by a video

camera which stores images on different layers having the same dimensions in order to display the moving image.

18. **Regarding Claim 41**, Maehara et al teach all the limitations of the claim.

19. **Regarding Claim 44**, the combination of Maehara et al and Hirano teach all the limitations of the claim.

20. **Regarding Claim 47**, Maehara et al teach that the system for capturing at least one image of an object, comprises of:

An image-capturing device having:

An area in which an object can be disposed for imaging, the area having an interior surface and an exterior surface, at least one lens coupled to a camera, the at least one lens being in operable communication with the interior of the area.

Means for commanding the at least one camera to acquire the at least one image of the object via the at least one lens (Fig.11).

Means for delivering the at least one image to a storage device (Fig.4).

21. **Regarding Claim 48**, Maehara et al teach that the interior surface is cylindrically shaped (Fig.11).

22. **Regarding Claim 49**, Maehara et al teach that the interior surface is cylindrically shaped in (Fig.11). It would be an obvious design preference if the inventor decided to change the interior surface into an spherically shaped entity.

23. **Regarding Claim 50**, Maehara et al teach that the system for capturing at least one image of an object and rendering the at least one image capable of being interacted with by a user, comprising of an image-capturing device comprising:

An approximately cylindrically shaped barrel having an exterior surface and an interior surface, the interior surface defining an interior aperture in which an object can be situated.

At least one lens associated with and in operable communication with at least one camera, the at least one lens exposed to the interior aperture.

Means for commanding the at least one camera to acquire the at least one image of the object via the at least one lens (Fig.11).

Means for delivering the at least one image to a storage device (Fig.4).

Software associated with and in operable communication with the storage device which is capable of controlling the display of the at least one image such that only one of the at least one images is perceivable by a user.

Software associated with and in operable communication with the storage device, which is capable of enabling at least one interactive function to be

carried out with respect to at least one image, whereby the at least one interactive function will give the user the illusion that the object is moving on the display (col.2, lines 58-62).

A processor on which the software for controlling the display and the software for enabling the at least one interactive function can be implemented (Fig.4).

24. **Regarding Claim 51**, Maehara et al teach all the limitations of the claim.

25. **Regarding Claim 52**, Maehara et al teach that the system for capturing a plurality of images of an object, comprises of an image-capturing device having:

(1) An area in which an object can be disposed for imaging, the area having an interior surface and an exterior surface (Fig.11).

(2) At least one lens coupled to a camera, the at least one lens being in operable communication with the interior of the area (Fig. 11).

(3) Means for commanding the at least one camera to acquire a first image of the object via the at least one lens (Fig.11).

(4) Means for moving the at least one camera relative to the object (Fig.12).

(5) Means for commanding the at least one camera to acquire a second image of the object via the at least one lens (col.36, lines 46-57).

(6) Means for delivering the first image and the second image to a user (Fig.9).

26. **Regarding Claim 53**, Maehara et al teach that the means for moving the camera relative to the object as images in the set of images are captured is software that controls movement of the lens (col.20, lines 24-34).

27. **Claims 25 and 26 are rejected under 35 U.S.C. 103(a) as being unpatentable over Maehera et al (Patent#: 6,556,201) and further in view of Ange (Patent#: 6,121,963).**

28. **Regarding Claim 25**, Maehara et al teach all the limitations except the language of the software is dynamic hypertext mark up language.
Ange teaches the above limitation in (col.5, lines 26-32).
Therefore it would have been obvious to one of ordinary skill in the art to apply within the invention of Maehara et al the using of Dynamic Hypertext Markup Language as the language of the software since Dynamic Hypertext Markup Language possesses the ability to layer images on top of other images.

29. **Regarding Claim 26**, Ange further teach that the language of the software is a combination of dynamic hypertext mark up language and JAVASCRIPT (col.5, lines 26-33).

30. **Claims 54-57 are rejected under 35 U.S.C. 103(a) as being unpatentable over Maehera et al (Patent#: 6,556,201) and further in view of Gulick, Jr. et al. (Patent#: 6,373,637).**

31. **Regarding Claim 54**, Maehara et al teach all the limitations of the claim except the means for delivering the at least one image to a lenticular sheet. Gulick, Jr. et al teach the above limitation in (col.5, lines 44-50). Therefore it would have been obvious to one of ordinary skill in the art to apply within the invention of Maehara et al the means for delivering the image to a lenticular sheet as taught by Gulick, Jr. et al in order to have the viewer see an image sequence that varies when the viewer changes the position of the image by applying pressure or moving their head relative to the image.

32. **Regarding Claim 55**, Gulick, Jr. et al teach that a lenticular sheet on which a plurality of images of an object have been deposited on a plurality of lenticular lenses, whereby a user is provided with the illusion of movement when pressure is applied to different portions of the lenticular sheet (col.5, lines 1-7).

33. **Regarding Claim 56**, Gulick, Jr. et al teach about a lenticular sheet assembly, the assembly comprising: a support surface layer, a lenticular layer containing a plurality of lenticular lenses on which at least one image has

been deposited; means for retaining the lenticular layer on the support surface layer wherein the means for retaining provides a gap between the lenticular layer and the support surface layer (col.6, lines 13-21).

34. **Regarding Claim 57**, Gulick, Jr. et al teach that the gap permits relative movement between the lenticular layer and the support surface layer when pressure is applied to the lenticular layer (col.6, lines 16-21).

35. **Claims 7,15,36 are rejected under 35 U.S.C. 103(a) as being unpatentable over Maehara et al (Patent #) and further in view of Hirano(Patent #) as applied to claims 1-6,23,24,27-32,34,41,44,47-53 above, and further in view of Smilansky et al(Patent # 6,323,856).**

36. **Regarding Claim 7**, the combination of Maehara et al and Hirano teach all the limitations except that the interactive function accepts input from the user that controls the degree to which and the speed with which the user perceives the illusion of movement in three dimensions.
Smilansky et al teach the above limitation in (col.4, lines 27-35).
Therefore it would have been obvious to one of ordinary skill in the to apply within the combination of Maehara et al. and Hirano, the interactive function to control the speed of the movement as taught by Smilansky et al in order to

have a means for controlling the speed and movement in a continuous realistic computer graphic.

37. **Regarding Claim 15**, Smilansky et al further teach that the interactive function causes the software for displaying each image layer to move the currently viewable image layer from a first position on the display to a second position on the display (col.3, lines 61-67). The reference teaches various image transformation techniques such as shift transformations, rigid transformations and transformations carried out as a result of camera movements.

38. **Regarding Claim 36**, Smilansky et al. teach that the interactive function enables the at least one object in the set of images to be moved in the horizontal, vertical or diagonal directions on the display (col.3, lines 61-67).

39. **Claims 8 and 45 are rejected under 35 U.S.C. 103(a) as being unpatentable over Maehara et al (Patent #6,556,201) and further in view of Hirano(Patent # 6,885,408) as applied to claims 1-6,23,24,27-32,34,41,44,47-53 above, and further in view of Robotham et al(Patent # 6,084,590).**

40. **Regarding Claim 8**, the combination of Maehara et al and Hirano teach all the limitations except that the interactive function causes the software for displaying each image layer to increase the resolution of the currently viewable image layer.

Robotham et al teach the above limitation in (col.8, lines 33-41).

Therefore it would have been obvious to one of ordinary skill in the art to apply within the combination of Maehara et al and Hirano the interactive function that causes the software for displaying each image layer to increase the resolution of the currently viewable image layer in order to generate images of higher quality and resolution while maintaining interactivity of the user with the image.

41. **Regarding Claim 45**, Robotham et al teaches the limitation in (col.8, lines 33-41).

42. **Claims 9 and 42 are rejected under 35 U.S.C. 103(a) as being unpatentable over Maehara et al (Patent #6,556,201) and further in view of Hirano(Patent # 6,885,408) as applied to claims 1-6,23,24,27-32,34,41,44,47-53 above, and further in view of Motoshima et al(Patent # 6,271,806).**

43. **Regarding Claim 9**, the combination of Maehara et al and Hirano teach all the limitations of the claim except that the interactive function causes the software for displaying each image layer to increase the resolution of the currently viewable image layer by increasing the size of the currently viewable image layer by equal amounts in the horizontal direction and in the vertical direction.

Motoshima et al addresses the above limitation in (col.2, lines 51-63).

Therefore it would have been obvious to one of ordinary skill in the art to apply within the combination of Maehera et al and Hirano the increasing the resolution by increasing the size as taught by Motoshima et al in order to have a bigger and better picture since a higher resolution results in a greater number of pixels.

44. **Regarding Claim 42**, the combination of Maehara et al and Hirano teach all the limitations of the claim except that the software associated with and in operable communication with the set of images which enables at least one interactive function to be carried out with respect to the set of images whereby the interactive function will give the user the illusion that the object is increasing in size on the display.

Motoshima et al teach the magnification of images in (col.2, lines 51-63).

45. **Claims 10,11 and 14 are rejected under 35 U.S.C. 103(a) as being unpatentable over Maehara et al (Patent # 6,556,201) and further in view of Hirano(Patent # 6,885,408) as applied to claims 1-6,23,24,27-32,34,41,44,47-53 above, and further in view of Haeberli (Pub#: 2003/0065590).**

46. **Regarding Claim 10**, The combination of Maehara et al and Hirano teach all the limitations of the claim except that the interactive function causes the software for displaying each image layer to increase the resolution of the currently viewable image layer and the size of the adjustable border of the viewing area.

Haeberli teach the above limitation in (Page 9, [0100]).

Therefore it would have been obvious to one of ordinary skill in the art to apply within the combination of Maehara et al and Hirano, the display of the increased resolution and the size of the adjustable border as taught by Haeberli to display a delineated preview image.

47. **Regarding Claim 11**, the combination of Maehara et al, Hirano and Haeberli teach all the limitations of the claim.

48. **Regarding Claim 14**, the combination of Maehara et al, Hirano and Haeberli teach all the limitations of the claim.

49. **Claims 16 and 33 are rejected under 35 U.S.C. 103(a) as being unpatentable over Maehara et al (Patent #6,556,201) and further in view of Hirano(Patent #6,885,408) as applied to claims 1-6,23,24,27-32,34,41,44,47-53 above, and further in view of Moe (Pub #: 2001/0029829).**

50. **Regarding Claim 16**, the combination of Maehara et al and Hirano teach all the limitations of the claim except that the system further includes a software for displaying a tool bar layer in which a tool bar is disposed, wherein the tool bar layer is perceptible from the point of view of the user along with the currently viewable image layer.

Moe teaches the above limitation in (Page 3, [0021]).

Therefore it would have been obvious to one of ordinary skill in the art to apply within the combination of Maehara et al and Hirano, the display of toolbar as taught by Moe in order to use it for controlling and monitoring the displayed material.

51. **Regarding Claim 33**, the combination of Maehara et al, Hirano and Moe teach all the limitations of the claim.

52. **Claims 17,20 and 35 are rejected under 35 U.S.C. 103(a) as being unpatentable over Maehara et al (Patent # 6,556,201) and further in view of Hirano(Patent # 6,885,408) as applied to claims 1-6,23,24,27-32,34,41,44,47-53 above, and further in view of Rosenholtz et al (Patent# 6,883,138).**

53. **Regarding Claim 17**, the combination of Maehara et al and Hirano address all the limitation of the claim except the software for providing a transparent layer that overlies the currently viewable image layer whereby the transparent layer is not perceptible from the point of view of the user.

Rosenholtz et al teach the above limitation in (col.11, lines 50-55).

Therefore it would have been obvious to one of ordinary skill in the art to apply within the combination of Maehara et al and Hirano the providing of the transparent layer as taught by Rosenholtz et al so that the original image remains visible but a change of color can be applied on the image.

54. **Regarding Claim 20**, the combination of Maehara et al, Hirano and Rosenholtz et al address all the limitations of the claim.

55. **Regarding Claim 35**, the combination of Maehara et al and Rosenholtz et al teach all the limitations of the claim. The overlaying of the transparent layer

is mentioned in Rosenholtz et al (col.11, lines 50-55). Dimensions of the transparent layer are an obvious design preference.

56. **Claims 12 and 13 are rejected under 35 U.S.C. 103(a) as being unpatentable over Maehara et al (Patent # 6,556,201) and further in view of Hirano(Patent # 6,885,408) and further in view of Haeberli (Pub # 2003/0065590) as applied to claim 10 above, and further in view of Robotham et al (Patent# 6,323,856).**

57. **Regarding Claim 12**, the combination of Maehara et al, Hirano and Haeberli teach all the limitations of the claim except that the interactive function causes the software for displaying each image layer to increase the resolution of the currently viewable image layer by increasing the size of the currently viewable image layer by equal amounts in the horizontal direction and the vertical direction.

Robotham et al mentions the above limitation in (col.8, lines 33-41)

Therefore it would have been obvious to one of ordinary skill in the art to apply within the combination of Maehara et al, Hirano and Haeberli, the interactive function that causes the software for displaying each image layer to increase the resolution of the currently viewable image layer in order to generate images of higher quality and resolution while maintaining interactivity of the user with the image.

58. **Regarding Claim 13**, Robotham et al teach about the resolution in (col.8, lines 34-41).

59. **Claims 18,19 and 43 are rejected under 35 U.S.C. 103(a) as being unpatentable over Maehara et al (Patent # 6,556,201) and further in view of Hirano(Patent # 6,885,408) and further in view of Smilansky et al (Patent# 6,323,856) as applied to claims 17,20 and 35 above, and further in view of Rosenholtz et al (Patent # 6,883,138).**

60. **Regarding Claim 18**, the combination of Maehara et al, Hirano and Smilansky et al teach all the limitations of the claim except the application of the transparent layer on the image.

The above limitation is mentioned in Rosenholtz et al (col.11, lines 50-55).

Therefore it would have been obvious to one of ordinary skill in the art to apply within the combination of Maehara et al, Hirano and Smilanksy et al the application of the transparent layer on the images as taught by Rosenholtz et al so that the original image remains visible but a change of color can be applied on the image.

61. **Regarding Claim 19**, the combination of Maehara et al, Hirano, Smilansky et al and Rosenholtz et al teach all the limitations of the claim.

62. **Regarding Claim 43**, the combination of Maehara et al, Hirano, Smilanksy et al and Rosenholtz et al teach all the limitations of the claim.

63. **Claims 21,22,37-39 and 40 are rejected under 35 U.S.C. 103(a) as being unpatentable over Maehara et al (Patent # 6,556,201) and further in view of Hirano(Patent # 6,885,408) and further in view of Rosenholtz et al (Patent # 6,883,138) as applied to claims 17,20 and 35 above, and further in view of Echerer et al (Patent #: 5,740,267).**

64. **Regarding Claim 21**, the combination of Maehara et al, Hirano and Rosenholtz et al teach all the limitations of the claim except that a line is drawn on the second transparent layer which corresponds to the distance between the first position and the second position.

Echerer et al teach the above limitation in (col.15, lines 12-15).

Therefore it would have been obvious to one of ordinary skill in the art to apply within the combination of Maehara et al, Hirano and Rosenholtz et al the drawing of line across the image as taught by Echerer et al in order to do measurements across the image in a visually indicative way.

65. **Regarding Claim 22**, Echerer et al further teach that the distance between the first position and the second position corresponds to an actual

physical dimension of an object depicted in the at least one image (col.13, lines 27-35).

66. **Regarding Claim 37**, Echerer et al teach that the software for interactive function enables the at least one object in the set of images to be zoomed in on to a selected degree (col.11, lines 48-61).

67. **Regarding Claim 38**, Echerer et al teach that the selected degree is controlled by a zoom factor (col.12, lines 33-41).

68. **Regarding Claim 39**, Echerer et al teach that the dimension of the at least one object in the set of images to be measured and correlated with a corresponding actual physical dimension of the at least one object (col.13, lines 27-35).

69. **Regarding Claim 40**, Echerer et al teach that at least one object in the set of images to be moved in the horizontal, vertical or diagonal directions on the display by calculating the difference between a first x coordinate and a first y coordinate on the transparent layer and a second x coordinate and a second y coordinate on the transparent layer and by translating the image layers in the set of images a distance on the display corresponding to the difference (col.12, lines 57-65).

70. **Claim 46 is rejected under 35 U.S.C. 103(a) as being unpatentable over Maehara et al (Patent # 6,556,201) and further in view of Hirano(Patent # 6,885,408) and further in view of Robotham et al (Patent # 6,323,856) as applied to claims 8 and 45 above, and further in view of Motoshima et al (Patent #: 5,740,267).**

71. **Regarding claim 46**, the combination of Maehara et al, Hirano and Robotham et al teach all the limitations of the claim except enlarging the image in the at least one image layer that is perceptible to the user enlarges the image to an equal degree in the horizontal direction and in the vertical direction.

Motoshima et al addresses the above limitation in (col. 2, lines 51-64).

Therefore it would have been obvious to one of ordinary skill in the art to apply within the combination of Maehara et al, Hirano and Robotham et al the enlarging of the image as taught by Motoshima et al in order to have a bigger and better picture since a higher resolution results in a greater number of pixels.

Any inquiry concerning this communication or earlier communications from the examiner should be directed to Supratik Chakraborty whose telephone number is (703)

272-7662. The examiner can normally be reached on Monday - Friday (7:30 am - 3:30 pm).

If attempts to reach the examiner by telephone are unsuccessful, the examiner's supervisor, Michael Razavi can be reached on (703) 272-7664. The fax phone number for the organization where this application or proceeding is assigned is 703-872-9306.

Information regarding the status of an application may be obtained from the Patent Application Information Retrieval (PAIR) system. Status information for published applications may be obtained from either Private PAIR or Public PAIR. Status information for unpublished applications is available through Private PAIR only. For more information about the PAIR system, see http://pair-direct.uspto.gov. Should you have questions on access to the Private PAIR system, contact the Electronic Business Center (EBC) at 866-217-9197 (toll-free).

SC

S.Chakraborty
11/4/2005

RICHARD HJERPE
SUPERVISORY PATENT EXAMINER
TECHNOLOGY CENTER 2600

11/9/05